THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

VOL. II. } **MADRAS, OCTOBER 1898.** { **No. 5.**

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 79.)

THIRD PA'DA.

This pâda will be concerned with an enquiry into the meaning of such of the Vedântic passages as contain explicit marks of Brahman, as also incidentally with determining as to who is qualified (for the study of this science):

The abode of heaven, earth etc., is the Parames'vara, owing to the word 'self' (I. iii. 1).

The passage referred to here occurs in the Mundaka-Upanishad and reads thus:

"In him the heaven, the earth and the sky are woven, the mind also with all the senses. Know him alone, the A'tman, and leave off other words. He is the bridge of the immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as the abode of the heaven and the earth is the Parames'vara or some other being.

* Mundaka-Upanishad 2—2—5.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It seems that some being other than Parames'vara *viz.* Vâyu, is the abode of the heaven, the earth etc., for he is declared to be the abode of all in the following passage:

"By air, as by a thread, O Gautama, this world and the other world, and all creatures are strung together."*

As against the foregoing, we hold as follows:

The Parames'vara is the abode of the heaven, the earth etc., because of the word 'A'tman' in the passage "Know him alone, the A'tman."

What is the objection to Vâyu, the Sûtrâtman, being denoted by the word 'A'tman'?

The Sûtrakâra answers thus:

And because of the declaration (that he is) reached by the liberated (I. iii. 2.)

It is none other than Parames'vara, because that Being is to be reached by the liberated souls,—those who are liberated from name and form generated by the meritorious and sinful acts—as declared in the following passages:

* Brihadâranyaka-Upanishad 5—7—2.

"When the seer sees the brilliant maker and lord (of the world) as the person who is the source of Brahman, then he is wise, and shaking off good and evil, he reaches the highest *Samyam* free from passions."*

"As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea, losing their name and their form, thus, a wise man, freed from name and form, goes to the divine Person who is greater than the great." †

How can this be possible in Vâyu? Vâyu becomes the Sûtrâtman only as ensouled by Parames'vara, inasmuch as Vâyu is one of the eight forms of the Parames'vara. Hence the conclusion that it is not Vâyu.

Not the subject of inference, for want of its designation; nor the living being (I. iii. 3.)

It cannot be maintained that what is spoken of as the abode of heaven, earth etc., refers to Pradhâna as known by inference, inasmuch as it is the upâdâna or material cause of all; for, there is no word denoting Pradhâna. Neither can it be the Jîva, for, then, it would involve an incongruity.

Because of the mention of a distinction (I. iii. 4.)

Here a distinction is made between I's'vara and Jîva in the following passage:

"On the same tree man (purusha) sits grieving, immersed, bewildered by his own impotence. But when he sees the other Lord contented and knows his glory, then his grief passes away." ‡

Wherefore He who is the Supreme Lord (Parames'vara) in Himself can alone be the abode of heaven, earth etc.

By the context (I. iii. 5.)

This section, indeed, treats of the Supreme, and begins thus:

"Now the supreme knowledge by which that Indestructible is known."§

Wherefore also, the Parames'vara is here referred to.

And on account of presence and eating (I. iii. 6.)

And also because, after having said that Jîva eats the fruits of his actions, the s'ruti speaks of Him who shines forth without eating, in the following passage:

* Mundaka-Upanishad 3—1—3.
† Ibid 3—2—8.
‡ Mundaka-Upanishad 3—1—2.
§ Mundaka—Upanishad 1-1-5.

"Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating."*

Hence the conclusion that it is the Parames'vara Himself, distinct from the Jîva, who is spoken of as the abode of heaven, earth etc.

Adhikarana 2.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to shew that unsurpassed Bliss is the result of reaching Parames'vara who, as has just been described, has to be reached by the liberated souls:

The Infinity (is Parames'vara) because of its mention after serenity (I. iii. 7.)

In the Chândogya-Upanishad, after declaring that "Infinity only is bliss," the s'ruti describes the nature of the Infinity as follows:

"Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, that is the Infinite."†

Here arises a doubt as to whether it is the Parames'vara or some other being who is denoted by the word 'Infinite.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The Infinite is some being other than Parames'vara, namely Prâna. When, as regards 'name' and other things mentioned in the previous passages, Nârada asked "Is there something better than a name?"‡ Sanatkumâra mentions "speech" and other things, in such words as "speech is better than a name;"§ but, after Prâna, s'ruti introduces the Infinite without resorting to a question and an answer. Because Parames'vara is thus not the subject of discourse here, therefore Prâna is the Infinite.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Parames'vara alone is denoted by the word 'Infinite,' as coming after 'serenity.' 'Serenity' means Jîva as spoken of in the s'ruti "Now that serene being which etc." || And he is referred to by the word 'Prâna.' After him, the Infinite is declared as something different from him in the words. "But in reality he declares what is beyond who declares the Highest Being to be the true,"¶ and so on. Here, after declaring that He who understands Prâna

* Ibid 3-1-1.
† Op. cit. 7-24-1.
‡ Ibid. 7-1-5.
§ Ibid. 7-2-1.
|| Ibid 8-3-4.
¶ Ibid 7-17-1.

declares that which is beyond in the words, "He who sees this, perceives this, and understands this, declares what is beyond ;* the s'ruti indicates, by the word 'but,' that he who declares the Highest Being to be the True is superior to him who is mentioned above, —to him who declares that Prâna is the Being who is beyond all. Therefore it is to be concluded that the being who is called the True and is the subject subsequently spoken of as the Highest Being, is superior to Prâna previously spoken of as the Highest Being. It is that Being who is described in a succeeding passage as possessed of the attribute of infinitude. He is even spoken of as A'tman in a passage next succeeding it, in the words "Next follows the explanation of the Infinite as the A'tman."† Wherefore the Infinite is the A'tman, none other than the Parames'vara, who is Superior to Jîva spoken of by the word 'Prâna.'

And owing to the appropriateness of the attributes (I. iii. 8).

The attributes that He rests in His own greatness, that He is the Atman of all, that He is the cause of all, and so on, are taught in the following passages :

"O Lord, wherein does He rest? In His own greatness."‡

"A'tman is all this."§

"From the Atman comes Prâna ; from the A'tman, hope."||

These are appropriate only when applied to Parames'vara, not to Jîva denoted by the word 'Prâna.' Wherefore, it may be concluded that Parames'vara alone is the Infinite, not the other.

(*Objection*) :—In the preceding adhikarana it was shewn that the liberated souls attain equality with Brahman, as said by the s'ruti "He reaches the highest equality free from passions."¶ Accordingly it is to be concluded that the liberated souls who have attained union with Brahman remain separate from Him. In the passage "where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite,"** it is declared that, when Brahman denoted by the word 'Infinite' is seen, there can be no perception of the universe as opposed to Brahman. How to reconcile this ?

* Ibid 7-15-4.

† Ibid 7-25-2.

‡ Chh. Up. 7—24—1.

§ Ibid. 7—25—2.

|| Ibid. 7—26—1.

¶ Mundaka-Upanishad. 3—1—3.

** Chh. Up. 7—22—1.

(*Answer*) :—The meaning of the assertion that "one sees nothing else" when the Infinite is immediately perceived, may be explained as follows : He whose nature is unsurpassed bliss, in whom—when immediately seen—merged, a man does not seek to perceive colour and other sense-objects with a longing for any more pleasures, He is the Infinite. He is Brahman. Indeed, the various kinds of sensuous pleasure are only the infinitesimally small fractions of Brahman's bliss. Accordingly the S'ruti says, "All other creatures live on a small portion of this bliss."* Wherefore here, as regards Brahman, there can be no denial of duality. We need not specially investigate as to how the perception of the universe which is alien to the highest end of man can be avoided so long as the universe exists. For, in the case of liberated souls, it is not the material (Prâkrita) universe which is perceived by them. On the other hand, it is Brahman Himself, whose essential nature is unsurpassed bliss, that forms the object of perception in the form of universe. Accordingly the S'ruti says :

"That, then, he becomes ; Brahman whose body is Light (âkâs'a), whose nature is true, whose delight is in Prâna (Supreme S'akti), whose bliss is in Manas."†

There, the liberated soul is introduced in the words "He attains to the state of self-effulgence, he attains to the mastery over manas," and so on. In "he is the master of speech" and so on, he is said to be endued with speech and other sense-organs which are under his own control, which are non-material (aprâkrita) and perfectly pure. To him, then, on attaining to that condition, this visible array of the material (prâkrita) universe becomes the very Brahman whose body is âkâs'a, *i. e.*, whose body is the Light of spiritual consciousness. This is the hidden meaning of the passage. Wherefore equality of the liberated souls with Brahman consists in their perceiving the universe as one with Brahman in essence. Hence the propriety of the whole doctrine.

Adhikarana.—3.

The Akshara (is Parames'vara) because of the supporting of (the universe) including a'ka's'a. (I. iii. 9).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Brihadâranyaka, and runs thus :

* Bri. Up. 6—3—32.

† Tait. Up. 1—6.

"O Gargî, the Brâhmans call this the Indestructible (Akshara). It is neither coarse nor fine, neither short nor long, neither red nor fluid; it is without shadow;"* and so on.

Here a threefold doubt arises as to the meaning of the word 'Akshara': does it refer to Pranava, Jîva or Parames'vara?

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—One of the two, Pranava or Jîva, is denoted by the word 'akshara.'—How?—It is but right that it should refer to Pranava inasmuch as the word 'akshara' is synonymous with 'letter.' It is also right that 'akshara' should refer to Purusha or Jîva, as said in the scriptural passage 'Purusha is termed akshara."† Wherefore they alone are referred to by the word 'akshara.'

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Here, it is Brahman who is denoted by the word 'akshara.' Why? Because the Akshara is said to support everything including âkâs'a. When Gârgî asked "In what then is the âkâs'a woven like warf and woof?"‡—that âkâs'a which is described as the basis of all phenomena in the passage, "That of which they say that it is above the heavens, beneath the earth, embracing heaven and earth, past, present, and future, that is woven, like warf and woof, in the âkâs'a,"§—Yâjñavalkya said, "O Gargî, the Brâhmanas call this the Akshara..................In that Akshara then, O Gargî, the âkâs'a, is woven, like warf and woof."|| We are taught that the Akshara so described supports the universe including âkâs'a. Where else is this possible except in the Paramâtman? Wherefore Parames'vara alone is the being denoted by the word 'Akshara.'

And that, by the command. (I. iii. 10).

And we are taught that this support is owing to the high command, as the S'ruti says, "By the command of that Akshara, O Gârgî, Sun and Moon stand apart"¶ Jîva cannot exercise such a command over the world, as the S'ruti says that there cannot be a second in the command of the world, in the passage, "One alone is Rudra: they are not for a second"**. Wherefore Parames'vara alone is denoted by the word 'Akshara.'

* Bri. Up. 5—8—8.
† Bhagavad Gita. XV. 16.
‡ Bri. Up. 5—8—7.
§ Ibid 5—8—7.
|| Bri. Up. 5—8—11.
¶ Ibid. 5—8—9.
** Atharvas'iras.

And because of the exclusion of distinction (I. iii. 11.)

"Distinction" means being a separate entity. The concluding portion of the passage,—namely, "This Akshara, O Gârgî, is unseen, but seeing: unheard, but hearing; unperceived, but perceiving; unknown, but knowing."—excludes the idea of the Akshara being distinct from Parames'vara, inasmuch as neither Jîva nor Pranava can be spoken of as seeing and being at the same time unseen. Hence the conclusion that Parames'vara alone is the Akshara.

Adhikarana.—4

This Adhikarana is intended to show that the Parames'vara, though beyond the reach of sensuous perception, yet becomes immediately perceptible to His devotees, as a result of His Supreme Mercy:

He is the object of perception, because of the mention (of His attributes). (I. iii. 12.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Pras'na Upanishad and reads as follows:

"Again he who meditates with this syllable '*Aum*' of three mâtrâs, on the Highest Purusha, he comes to light and to the sun. And as a snake is freed from its skin, so is he freed from evil. He is led up by the Sâman verses to the Brahma-world, and than Him who is superior to the Jîva-mass he sees the Higher Purusha lying in the body."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the entity spoken of as the object of perception is the Parames'vara or some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—He is not the Parames'vara. He is none other than the Hiranyagarbha, as the s'ruti speaks of the attainment of his regions, in the words, 'by the Sâman verses, he is led up to the Brahma-world.' And the world 'Highest' too is applicable to him who is the highest of the Jîvas. Or, it may be Nârâyana; for he is the being denoted by the word 'Purusha'. He can also be spoken of as higher than the Hiranyagarbha who is the aggregate of the Jîvas. He alone is known to be designated by Pranava. His abode alone is declared in the s'ruti to be intuited by the wise, in the words, "That supreme abode of Vishnu do the wise ever see;"† and in the concluding verse this fact is thus referred to:

* Op. Cit. 5-5.
† Taittirîya-Samhitâ 4—2—9.

"Through the Rik-verses he arrives at this world, through the Yajus-verses at the sky, through the Sâman-verses at that which the wise teach."*

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Here the object of the act of perception is the Parames'vara, because of the mention of His distinguishing attributes such as tranquillity in the following passage:

"The wise arrives at that which is tranquil, free from decay, from death, from fear,—the Highest"†

Indeed, in the Hiranyagarbha who is a creature of the Parames'vara, no such attributes as tranquillity can exist. The term 'Brahma-world' means the region of S'iva—the Para-brahman—which is worthy of attainment. He, indeed, who is 'higher than him who is superior' to the Hiranyagarbha, the aggregate of Jîvas spoken of as 'Jîva-mass'—is declared as the object of meditation. Hence the untenability of the view that the Hiranyagarbha is meant here (to be the object of perception).

As to the assertion that Nârâyana is meant here, it needs investigation. How can he be spoken of as eternally free, as the cause of fearlessness, as the supreme, beyond all universe, as taught in the words "free from death, from fear, and highest"? He is, indeed, of the form of the universe. And how then to explain the statement that the devotee directly sees Him who is higher than Nârâyana—than him who is superior even to Hiranyagarbha the 'jîva-mass,'—Him who lies in the body as the Antaryâmin and is therefore called Purusha, Him who is Para-brahman? Indeed, the s'ruti declares as follows:

"Superior to Nârâyana is Brahman."‡

"True, real, the Supreme Brahman, the spirit (Purusha), dark and yellowish, celebate, diverse-eyed"§

Wherefore it is but right to maintain that the s'ruti—"he sees the Purusha lying in the body, Greater than the Great,"—declares as the object of perception Him who is called Purusha as dwelling in the Dahara-lotus in the body; who is denoted by the Pranava, as declared in the s'ruti, "Designated by that (Pranava) which is merged in its root (the syllable *a*) is He who is the Highest, the Mahes'vara (Great Lord);" who, as said in the s'ruti "Brahman who is greater than Nârâyana," is greater than Nârâyana who is the form of universe; who is true and real, as devoid of all divergence in speech and thought; who, as possessed of three eyes, is said to be diverse-eyed; who, as coloured by the Supreme Energy (Para-s'akti) called Umâ—a word formed of the constituent sounds of the Pranava in their reversed order,—is described as dark and yellowish; who is the supreme all-transcending Brahman. Now as to the assertion based on the s'ruti "That Supreme abode of Vishnu": there is no incongruity whatever, inasmuch as that very supreme form of Vishnu which, when looked apart from the universe, is made of unsurpassed bliss, is itself the Supreme Brahman called S'iva. That is to say, there is no essential distinction between Vishnu and S'iva, the material and efficient causes of the universe, except what is due to a difference of state.

* Prasna-Upanishad 5—7.
† Ibid 5-7.
‡ Mahana-Upanishad.
§ Ibid.

Adhikarana 5.

Thus, it has been shown here that the Sâkshâtkâra or direct perception of Parabrahman, the diverse-eyed,—who is above the universe including Vishnu, Brahmâ and so on, who, lying in the body as an act of Grace to the devotee, is called Purusha, who is associated with Umâ, the Supreme Energy (Parama-S'akti),—enables His devotees who are always intent on His name, Pranava, to attain Him, by way of bringing about the cessation of all samsâra. This adhikarana proceeds to speak of His residence in the body and of His worship:

Dahara (is Parames'vara), because of the next-mentioned (attributes) (I. iii. 13).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad and reads as follows:

"There is this city of Brahman, and in it the palace, the small (dahara) lotus and in it that Dahara (small) âkâs'a. Now what exists in that Dahara-âkâs'a, that is to be sought for, that is to be understood."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is the material ether (Bhûtâkâs'a), or Jîva, or Parames'vara that is denoted by the word 'dahara.'

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The application of the word 'âkâs'a being restricted to the material ether, 'Dahara-âkâs'a' denotes bhûtâkâs'a or material ether. Or, the word 'dahara' refers to Jîva, because the word means 'small in size' and is therefore applicable to

* Op. Cit. 8-1-1.

Jîva who is *anu*, of atomic size. 'Dahara' cannot denote the all-pervading Parames'vara.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: 'Dahara-akâs'a is none other than the Parames'vara. Why? Because of the attributes next mentioned, such as the attributes of being free from sin and so on, thus declared in a subsequent passage of the section:

> "This A'tman is free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, free from hunger and thirst, of unfailing desires, of unfailing will." *

How can these exist in the Jîva who is a samsârin, a being of the world? Wherefore Dahara-âkâs'a is none other than the I's'vara, possessed of the attribute of being free from sin, and so on.

And because of going and of the word. So indeed it is found; and there is an indicating mark (I, iii, 14).

'Dahara-âkâs'a' denotes Parames'vara, also because it is declared that the creatures daily go into this Dahara-âkâs'a, and because it is spoken of as 'Brahma-loka' in the following passage in the same context:

> "As people who do not know the country walk again and again over a gold treasure that has been hidden somewhere in the earth and do not discover it, thus do all these creatures day after day go into the Brahma-loka, and yet do not discover it, because they are carried away by untruth." †

So, indeed, elsewhere the s'ruti speaks of the creatures thus going to the Parames'vara, as found in the following passage:

> "In the same manner, my son, all these creatures, when they have become merged in the True, know not that they are merged in the True." ‡

We also find the word Brahma-loka applied to the same in the following passage:

> "This is Brahma-loka, O King." §

Moreover, even leaving out of consideration the fact that the s'ruti speaks *elsewhere* of the creatures daily going to Brahman and refers to the Dahara-âkâs'a by the word 'Brahma-loka,' we find ample evidence, showing that Dahara-âkâs'a is Parames'vara, in the section under discussion which speaks of all creatures going daily to Brahman and contains the word 'Brahma-loka' referring to Dahara-âkâs'a.

* Ibid. 8—1—5.
† Ibid. 8—3—2.
‡ Ibid. 6—9—2.
§ Bri. Up. 6—3—32.

Because of His greatness—the supporting (of the universe)—being found in this (Dahara-a'ka's'a). (I. iii. 15)

The act of supporting the universe, which constitutes the Parames'vara's greatness, is predicated of this Dahara-âkâs'a, in the following passage:

> "Now that A'tman is the limit, the support, so that these worlds may not become jumbled up."*

And this supporting of the universe forms the greatness of Parames'vara, as the following s'ruti declares:

> "He is the lord of all, the master of all beings, the protector of all beings. He is the limit, the support, so that these worlds may not become jumbled up."†

Wherefore also, Dahara-âkâs'a is Parames'vara.

And it being well-known (that He is to be worshipped there). (I. iii. 16).

The Mahopanishad says:

> "There is that small lotus situated in the body's midst, free from sin, the abode of the great; and therein is the Dahara (small) âkâs'a, free from grief; and that which is there within has to be worshipped."‡

The Kaivalya-Upanishad says:

> "Having regarded the heart-lotus as free from all stain,.........and having contemplated the Lord Parames'vara, with His helpmate Umâ, as the Trilochana (three-eyed), as Nîlakantha (dark-necked) as serene..........."

From such passages as these it is clear that Parames'vara associated with Umâ is to be contemplated as dwelling within the small lotus. For this reason also, Dahara-âkâsa is Paramesv'ara.

(Objection):—From such passages in another Upanishad as "In that âkâs'a within the heart, there reposes the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all,"§ it is clear that the Parames'vara is to be contemplated as dwelling in the Dahara-âkâsa within the small lotus. Here He is to be contemplated as the Dahara-âkâs'a itself. There is thus a self-contradiction in the Upanishads.

(Answer):—Even here it is the Parames'vara dwelling within the Dahara-âkâs'a that has to be con-

* Chhâ. Up. 8—4—1.
† Bri. Up. 6—4—22.
‡ Mahânâ. Up. 10.
§ Bri. Up. 6—4—22.

templated. But, inasmuch as sinlessness and other attributes of Parames'vara are found predicated of Dahara-âkâs'a, Parames'vara may also be spoken of as Dahara-âkâs'a when conceived as *Chid-ambara*, as enrobed in the Spiritual Light.

(If you say that)—owing to reference to the other—that (other) is meant here, (we reply) no, owing to impossibility (I. iii. 17.)

(*Objection*) :—The other, namely jîva, is referred to in the following passage :

> "Now that serene being who, after having risen from out this earthly body, and having reached the highest Light, appears in his true form, that is the A'tman : thus he spoke."*

Therefore the âkâs'a under discussion can be no other than the Jîva.

(*Answer*) :—No; because the attributes mentioned above, such as freedom from sin, cannot pertain to him. Wherefore âkâs'a properly refers here to none other than Parames'vara to whom those attributes belong.

(If you say that it is ji'va) because of the subsequent (passage), (we hold that it speaks of ji'va) whose true nature has manifested itself (I. iii. 18.)

(*Objection*) :—In the sequel, in Prajapati's words, the s'ruti declares that Jîva is devoid of all sin and so on, thus :

> "The A'tman who is free from sin, free from old age, from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, whose desires never fail, whose will is ever true, He it is whom we must search out; He it is whom we must try to know. He who has searched out that A'tman and understands Him obtains all worlds and all desires."

The s'ruti also speaks of the characteristic mark of Jîva—namely his association with the three avasthâs or states—in the following passages :

> "That person who is seen in the eye, he is A'tman ; thus he said."†

* Chhà. Upanishad 8-3-4.
† Chhà. Upanishad 4-15.

> "He who moves about happy in dreams, he is the A'tman."*

> "When a man being asleep, reposing, and at perfect rest, sees no dreams, that is the A'tman."†

Therefore it is right to say that Jîva is here referred to.

(*Answer*) :—There is no force in this contention. Here the s'ruti describes Jîva whose attributes, such as sinlessness, had been veiled by the body generated by his own beginningless sin and karma, but who, when afterwards become united to the Supreme Light, has his own true nature manifested, as well as the attribute of freedom from sin and the like ; it is not the Jîva who is of samsâra.

But the Dahara-âkâs'a denotes the Being whose several blessed inherent attributes are never hidden. Thus, the Dahara-âkâs'a here spoken of is neither bound nor liberated.

The reference serves a different purpose. (I, iii, 19).

The manifestation of Jîva's true nature on reaching the Supreme Being denoted by the word Dahara-âkâs'a is spoken of in the following passage :

> "Having risen from out this earthly body, and having reached the highest light, he appears in his true form." ‡

Here the reference to Jîva serves to show that such is his greatness. Hence no contradiction.

(If you hold that Jiva is here referred to) because of the s'ruti speaking of smallness, this has been answered. (I, iii, 20).

As to the objection that, as dwelling in a small place, the Dahara-âkâs'a must be a limited being, and that it is therefore not the Supreme Being here referred to,—it has already been answered in the sûtra I, ii, 7.

A. Mah'adeva S'a'stri, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Ibid 8-10-1.
† Ibid 8-11-1.
‡ Ibid. 8—3—4.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR OF ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 55*).

BHARKARIAN'S STATEMENT.

Parinama Vadam.

1. Though agreeing with the Mayavadi in regarding the Veda as Swayambu yet he differs from him in regard to the end of the Veda, and postulates both *betham* and *abetham* of *Brahm*. This philosophy we will expound herein.

2. It is Chit that evolves by Parinama into this world and Jivas, so Sat (Brahm) is all. The Vedas declare the means whereby the bliss of Moksha can be secured. If these means are followed, the Jiva will lose his separateness and become One with Brahm. So the *Parinamavadi* states.

His Refutation.

1. Brahm cannot become this world, as the same entity cannot become matter and yet be separate from matter. If you instance the salt present in union with sea-water, even then, the nature of salt is quite distinct from the water and the subject cannot divide itself into subject and object. Why do you confuse yourself whose intelligence is so ponderable!

2. If you assert that this world forms only a fractional part of God, then this part becomes destroyed in time, and is reproduced from maya. If you say that it resolves into Brahman itself, then this portion of Brahman becomes mere insentient matter only, by reason of this origination and dissolution. And as you yourself evolve with this world, your intelligence aspiring to *soham* cannot itself be real and cannot but be insentient matter.

3. You instanced the seed as the Brahm and the tree as the world. Then your describing God as Eternal and unchangeable cannot be true and your Brahm will change into insentient matter and die out again as such. Besides, when the seed developes into the tree it has the support of the earth (for nourishment etc.) but whence does your Brahman derive support.

O you, who have become Brahman, you will be ridiculed by the world as mad.

2. The seed and the tree, gold and ornaments, sea, and salt produced from sea are the familiar analogies of this school.

4. If you say that as from gold is produced all kinds of ornaments, so all this world is God, then it must follow that there must be a person who created this world and persons for whom this world was created, as we infer from your analogy, persons who made the gold ornaments and persons who wear them.

5. The Jiva cannot reach the Heaven of Moksha, if its intelligence and volition die out. Yet you say, he can reach Brahman by losing his intelligence and volition. If this individual intelligence &c. die out, then there is nothing to unite with God. If without such annihilation, you can reach bliss, then why don't you enjoy it in this body, but instead, try to rid yourself of it and subject yourself to all sorts of mortification.

THE NIRISHWARA SANKHYA SYSTEM.

Prakriti divides itself into Mula, Puriashtaka and Vikriti; and Sthula, Sukshuma and Param. The Purusha evolving in conjunction with the evolution of the worlds and bodies fancies he is one with them and when he understands from attaining wisdom that he is different from Prakriti he attains Moksha. So the Nirishvara Sankhya states.

5. Mula or Root is here identified by our commentators with *Chitta* or Intellect, in which case what Mr. Davies says cannot be correct. He says, "The mental physiology of Kapila is imperfect. The 'intellect' (buddhi) merely represents sensational ideas in a complete form to the gaze of the soul and the soul never acts. It does not appear therefore how abstract ideas are formed or by what means a course of reasoning can be carried on. The Vedantists add a fourth faculty called *Chitta*, the thinking or reasoning faculty." We are not sure also if he is correct in translating *buddhi* as intellect and *chitta* as reason. See pp. 48 and 49 Sivagnanabotham for our definition of these terms. Puriashtaka comprise *Manas*, *Buddhi* and *Ahankara* and the five tanmatra, sound, sight, touch, smell and taste. Vikriti are the gross elements and senses,—namely, five elements, five organs of sense, the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue and the skin; the five organs of action (*Karmendriya*) the voice, hand, the feet, the anus and the organs of generation. The *Sankhya Karika* gives a slightly different classification. Prakriti (mula) is not produced. Prakriti in this sense is the Tamil word Pakuthi (பகுதி). That which is produced is Vikriti, same as Tamil (Vikuthi) (விகுதி). Mahat or Buddhi, and Ahankara and the 5 *tanmatras* are both Pakuthi, (பகுதி) as they are producing and Vikuthi (விகுதி) as they are produced from Mula Prakriti. The rest 16 are Vikuthi விகுதி only (including the 5 elements and 5 senses and 5 organs of action and manas). The five tanmatras are produced from Ahankara. So the number of tatwas (Prakriti) is variously given as 24 or 19, when we include the 5 tanmatras or omit them in the enumeration. Including Purusha, the total number is 25. The Siddhanta classification, as will be seen from the table printed in No. 11, Vol. I of this *Magazine*, accepts these 25 tatwas and postulates 11 more, *c.f.* Vayusamhita, Purva 25, Ch. 15.

"Sankhya yoga prasiddhani tatvanyapi kanichit
Siva sâstra prasiddhani tatônyaniyapi critnasah."

Prakriti is called *Mula* as it is the root of all the 24 tatwas, and as it is the first cause and is causeless it is called *Param*. The Puriashtaka form the *Sukshuma Sarira*. Th gross body, *Stula Sarira* is formed of Manas, Buddhi, and Ahankara, 5 tanmatras, 5 senses, and 5 organs of action. Mula Prakriti or Pradhana is called Avyakta or unmanifested and the rest of the tatwas are called Vyakta or manifest. The manifested or seen is Sat, and the manifested is Asat (unseen). The soul or *Purusha* or *Buman* is unmanifested or Avyata. Asat is explained as அப்பிர காசமாய் நிற்றல் or விளங்காமல் நிற்றல் or முனைத்திடாமை by Saint Meikandan and Saint Arul Nandi and that this is the original and true meaning and not unreal or non-existent or illusory will be apparent from the learned note on 'Sat and Asat' from Mr. J. A. Davies M. A., which we take the liberty to extract to-day. We stated elsewhere how this misreading and misunderstanding and incorrect translation have been the parent of so much confusion and tortuous reasoning. The phrase 'Sat and Asat' and 'neither Sat nor Asat' occurs very frequently and always in conjunction as a phrase in the Gita, Mahabarata and Upanishads and Vedas; and when it is said of God or Soul that it is 'neither Sat nor Asat' the meaning is intelligible enough if the phrase (Sat and Asat) means only Prakriti (both unmanifest and manifest), but it is quite unmeaning if God is spoken of as neither existing nor non-existing, neither real nor unreal. The mistake consists in reading into these primitive words mistaken notions developed in quite medieaval times. The original meaning is still preserved in popular language—when a man states what he saw with his own eyes and saw with his own ears, that is Sat and Satyam (truth) and the rest is not Satyam. A hearsay evidence might be as much of a truth by itself as direct testimony, and yet the latter is alone truth, though a witness giving hearsay evidence is not a liar. The word Sat originally meaning seen and latterly meaning truth, and from truth to permanency, and the only thing permanent, thus it came to be applied to Soul, and God and as distinguished from them, Prakriti was called Asat, and when the word Sat has been more often confined to God, the word *Satasat* has been brought into use to mean Soul or Purusha. The same changes can be traced in other words also, as in the word Atma, which beginning to mean mere life, living things, animals, living body, manas, soul and going up to God, has been latterly confined to mean Soul and God, and necessity arising to distinguish between these two 'Atmas,' the words Paramatma and Atma have come into use. In the Tamil language these last meanings have become fixed, Atma meaning only Soul or Purusha and not God; and Paramatma meaning God; though owing to the recent Sanskrit revival, some thoughtless writers of Tamil are again trying to confuse these words *vide—Chudamani Nigantu.*

"தெரிதரு முயிரேயாதன் சேதனன் பசுவேசீவன்,
அரியபுந் கலனேகூத்தன் அணுவிடமானன் **ஆன்மா**."

NOTE—ON THE MEANING OF SAT AND ASAT.*

There is a general misunderstanding of these terms as used in the philosophy of the Hindus, especially in the system of Kapila. Sat is supposed to mean existence and Asat is therefore represented as its logical opposite, or, rather contradictory, the negation of being, or non-existence. Thus Dr. Muir writes: "These ideas of entity and non-entity seem to have been familiar to the Vedic poets and we find it thus declared (R. V. X. 72, 2, 3.), that in the beginning non-entity was the source of entity. 'In the earliest age of the gods entity sprang from non-entity; in the first age of the gods entity sprang from non-entity (asat).' In the Atharva Veda X. 7. 10.) it is said that 'both non-entity and entity exist within, the god Skambha;' and in V. 25 of the same hymn, 'powerful indeed are those gods who sprang from non-entity. Men say that that non-entity is once the highest member of Skambha.' The Taittiriya Upanishad also (P-99), quotes a verse to the effect: 'This was at first non-entity. From that sprang entity (Sat)." And in a note he adds: "This phrase is also applied to Agni in R. V. X. 5. 7, where it is said that that god, being 'a thing both Asat, non-existent (*i.e.*, unmanifested), and Sat, existent (*i.e.*, in a latent state or in essence), in the highest heaven, in the creation of Daksha, and in the womb of Aditi, became in a former age the first boon of our ceremonial, and is both a bull and a cow'" (Progress of the Vedic Religion, Journal A. S., 1865, P. 347). So also Professor Max Muller writes: "Some of the ancient sages, after having arrived at the idea of Avyakrita, undeveloped, went even beyond, and instead of the Sat or *To on*, they postulated an Asat, *To my on* as the beginning of all things. Thus we read in the Chhandogya Uparishad "And some say in the beginning there was Asat (not being) alone, without a second; and from this Asat might the Sat be born'" (Sans. Literature, P. 324). There is occasionally some confusion in the minds of Hindu writers, especially the later ones, about the meaning of Sat and Asat; but, with Kapila and his exponents, Sat denotes the existence of things in the manifold forms of the external world, the *Daseyn* of Hegel, the *Natura naturata* of Spinoza, and Asat is the opposite of this or the formless Prakriti, the mind-matter from which all formal existence has sprung. Sat corresponds in each separate form to the "being-this" of Hegel, and Kapila argues, as the German philosopher, that "by virtue of its predicate of merely being this, every something, is a finite," and therefore it is an effect, because otherwise we could only conceive it as absolute being, and therefore unlimited. Soul was something different from both. So in the Satapatha Brahmana (X. 5, 3, 1.) it is said, "in the beginning this universe was, as it were, and was not, as it were. Then it was only that mind. Wherefore it has been declared by the rishi, 'There was then neither non-entity (asat) nor entity (sat); for mind was, as it were, neither entity nor non-entity." The meaning is that mind is neither the primal matter (Prakriti), (which Kapila assumed to be the source of all formal existence), nor the sum of existing things. The Vedantists taught that this primal matter was the Sakti, or productive energy of Brahma. So says Sankara Acharya "We (Vedantists) consider that this primordial state of the world is dependent upon the Supreme Deity, (Paramesvara), and not self-dependent. And this state to which we refer must of necessity be assumed, as it is essential; for without it the creative action of Supreme Deity could not be accomplished, since if he were destitute of his Sakti, any activity on his part would be inconceivable." (Comm.) on the Brahma Sutras, Muir's Sans. Texts IV. 164). The full development of the Vedantist's doctrine made the external world to be only maya, illusion. There is nearly neither Sat nor Asat, but the Supreme Spirit is absolutely the All. Nature is only the projection of the One, or, as Hegel thought, for he was essentially a Vedantist. "The idea in its externality, in having fallen from itself into a without in time and space;" but this is only a manifestation of the Ab-

* Extracted from "*The Hindu Philosophy*" by J. A. DAVIES, M. A., M. R. A. S., Turbner's Oriental series.

solute. "The Absolute, the being-thinking (the ultimate synthesis of existence and thought, of object and subject), passes through the three periods, and manifests itself as idea in, and for itself, (thinking).; secondly, in its being otherwise, or in objectiveness and externality, (nature) thirdly, as the idea which from its externality, has returned itself, (mind)." (Chalybaüs, Hist of Spec. Phil. Eng. ed. P. 362). As Mr. Morrell has expounded his views and correctly, I may add, "With him God is not a person, but personality itself, *i. e.* the universal personality which realizes itself in every human consciousness, as so many separate thoughts of one eternal mind... God is with him, the whole process of thought, combining in itself the objective movement as seen in Nature with the subjective as seen in logic, and fully realizing itself only in the universal, spirit of humanity." (Mod Phil. II. 189). Pure Vedantism? though Hegel, if he were alive, would protest, against such a statement. But Kapila, was not a Vedantist. With him, the aggregate, of existing things, and each separate existence, (Sat)., and the formless Prakriti from which they issued (Asat), were objectively real and eternally distinct from Soul, though both Soul and Prakriti are eternal, and uncaused. Dr. Muir, however, refers to the commentators, on the Rig-Veda, who explain Asat as meaning, "an undeveloped state" and adds that if we accept this statement, there will be no contradiction Asat does not mean simply an undeveloped state but the state of pure or formless existence, of the primal substance from which all forms have sprung. It is clear, however, that if Asat means, an undeveloped state then Sat must mean, not the essence of anything, but a developed state, the development of the existing world as Kapila uses it. The writer of the Vedic hymn (R. V. X. 57) meant to say that Agni was Asat, but, became Sat in the birth. (Janman), of Daksha and in the womb of Aditi. It is clear also that Kapila, in this part of his system, incorporated, an older theory, in which Asat denoted, at least the undeveloped state from which existing things have been developed. Sat was the whole of existent things. In Rig-Veda. I. 96, 7, Agni is called Sat as gopa, the guardian of that which has a present being. There is also the germ of another part of his system in a hymn of this Veda. (X. 129). "There was then neither Asat nor Sat." There was only the one Supreme Spirit dwelling in self-existence. "Desire, then, in the beginning, (agree) arose in It, which was the earliest germ of mind, and wise men there beheld in their heart, not being ignorant, that this is the bond between Asat and Sat." In the system of Kapila, it is an unconscious impulse on the art of Prakriti, or instinctive desire to set the soul free from matter which causes the emanation of Prakriti into the manifold forms of developed life (Sat). This latter was, in Kapila's view, an effect, because developed, and implying therefore a developing cause.

His Refutation.

1. If the Purusha's intelligence is pure, Prakriti cannot envelope it. As such, even after Moksha, he will become covered again. As we cannot get rid of the evil effects of Prakriti by perceiving them to be evil with the aid of the Supreme Intelligence (Para-sakti or Divine Arul), he can never attain Moksha. To the Pure Being (God) there is no veiling by Mula-prakriti.

2. When the Purusha is united to Prakriti, the Purusha's intelligence becomes cleared up a little and with this it guides the dark Prakriti and eats the fruits thereof, as does the lame man seated on the back of the blind man guides the latter, so the Purusha is not the Lord (God). He who unites both and actuates their intelligence and activity is no other than the *Ninmala* (Hara).

3. The Purusha is not *self-luminous*. Prakriti is insentient. Know that there is a First Cause who evolves these two. If mukti is attained by knowledge (that you are not prakriti) no, you cannot get it by such knowledge. For removing the bondage, the help of the person who brought about the union is required. This bondage will be removed by the Grace of God. By following the fourfold path of Sariya, &c. secure the Grace of the *Ninmala* God, and remove your physical bondage.

J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B. A., B. L.,

(*To be continued*).

THAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 84*).

இனியே தெமக்குனருள் வருமோ வெனக்கருதி
யேங்குதே நெஞ்சமையோ
இன்றைக் கிருந்தாரை நாளைக் கிருப்பரென்
றெண்ணவோ திடமில்லையே
அனியாய மாயிந்த வுடலைநா னென்றுவரு
மந்தகற் காளாகவோ
ஆடித் திரிந்துநான் கற்றதுங் கேட்டது
மவலவாய்ப் போதனன்றோ
கனியேனும் வறியசெங் காயேனு முதிர்சருகு
கந்தமூ லங்களேனும்
கனல்வாதை வந்தெய்தி னள்ளிப் புசித்துநான்
கண்மூடி மௌனியாகித்
தனியே யிருப்பதற் கெண்ணினே னெண்ணமிது
சாமிநீ யறியாததோ
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (௧௦௪)

104. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! I merely wear away* under complete despondency that I may not at all get Thy blessed Grace, inasmuch as, O Lord, I cannot be confident of visiting again to-morrow, any person whom I might meet to-day. The book of Fate lies quite concealed.

Alas! The God of death should come at any moment in a proud attitude and take away *this* physical body. Is it *all* my merit that I should end this life in mere *suffering* although I have had good deal of struggle to acquire the spiritual knowledge by reading and by hearing?

O Supreme Lord, art Thou not cognisant of my internal desire to quench the fire of hunger by * stuffing up my belly either with fruits or with unripe fruits or with dead leaves or vegetables and sit silent in Thy contemplation in solitude, with my eyes closed for ever?†

மத்தமத கரிமுகிற் குலமென்ன நின்றிலகு
வாயிலுடன் மதியகடுதோய்
மாடகூ டச்சிகர மொய்த்தசந் திரகாந்த
மணிமேடை யுச்சிமீது
முத்தமிழ் முழக்கமுடன் முத்தநகை யார்களொடு
முத்தமுத் தாய்க்குலாவி
மோகத் திருந்துமென் யோகத்தி னிலைநின்று
மூச்சைப் பிடித்தடைத்துக்
கைத்தல நகப்படை விரித்தபுலி சிங்கமொடு
கரடிநுழை நூழைகொண்ட
கானமலை யுச்சியிற் குகையூ டிருந்துமென்
கரதலா மலகமென்னச்
சத்தமற மோனநிலை பெற்றவர்க ளுய்வர்காண்
சனகாதி துணிவிதன்றோ
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே (௧௦௫)

105. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

What if a man is placed in the pleasures of the household, say, such as rejoicing in company with the women of pearl-like teeth charming and excelling in beauty and best conversant in Tamil in its three-fold* classifications, in a lofty palace, at the top-most story, so high as to reach the moon-centre and so well built up of moon-stones as to, by itself, excite lust therewith, and where in front of the gate are arrayed the elephants which are as dark as the thick-gathered clouds? Or, on the other hand, what is the use † of merely living the secluded life of a recluse, say, sitting dumb in Yoga, controlling the breath, either in caves or in the summits of dark-wooded mountains where there are lairs of long-clawed tigers, lions or bears?

Is it not a fact as clear as day-light that those only can expect themselves to be saved who set upon *Thy Divine contemplation* in silence? Is *this* not the fundamental Truth aimed at by the *Munis* Sanaka &c.

* *c. f.* 36th and 48th verses regarding 10 vital airs.

† The Saint gives a caution to himsslf to invoke and get, if he can, the Supreme Lord's Arul before ever he should discard his body which is quite uncertain. *c. f.* "Procrastination is the thief of time." "Winnow the corn while the wind blows."

* The 3 classes of Tamil are (1) இயற்றமிழ் (Natural grammatical Tamil whether prose or poetry), (2) இசைத்தமிழ் (Tamil adapted to music), (3) நாடகத்தமிழ் (dramatic Tamil).

† The Saint points out in this verse that there is no evil of household life; nor any real bliss or benefit in a *Sannyasin's* life of mere yoga practice. Under either conditions of human life one would do well only if he should fix himself upon God's Grace in contemplation. *c. f.* the Saint's stanza

"சாட்டையிற் பம்பரசாலம்போலெல்லாம்,
ஆட்டுவானிறையெனவறிந்து நெஞ்சமே,
தேட்டமொன்றறவருட் செயலினிற்றியேல்,
வீட்டறந் துறவறமிரண்டு மேன்மையே."

(Just like a top on its point made to spin
By means of a cord; so do yourself see
That th' Lord rules all; and were you, then, to win
Th' Lord's Grace alone, in world or retired be).

கைத்தலம் விளங்குமொரு நெல்லியங் கனியெனக்
கண்டவே தாகமத்தின்
காட்சிபுரு ஷார்த்தமதின் மாட்சிபெறு முத்தியது
கருதினனு மானமாதி
உத்திபல வாகிரு விகற்பமே லில்லையா
லொன்றோ டிரண்டென்னவோ
உரையுமில்லை நீயுமில்லை நானுமில்லை யென்பது
முபாயநீ யுண்டுநானும்
சித்தமுள ளுனில்லை யெனும்வசன நீயறிவை
தெரியார்க டெரியவசமோ
செப்புகே வலநீதி யொப்புவமை யல்லவே
சின்முத்தி ராங்கமரபில்
சத்தமற வென்னையாண்ட குருமௌனி கையினாற்
றமியனேற் குதவுபொருளே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (கoசு)

106. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Clear as a nelli* fruit on the palm are the four *purusharthas* † announced in the Vedagamas. Of these the fourth and the supremest is the *moksha.* To think of this Final End to be aimed at by the souls and to understand truly its nature. Different *schools* of philosophy define It differently by means of several logical methods such as *anumana*‡ &c. But in the soul's undifferentiated *anubhava*§ of the profound meditation on Thee, these logical reasonings cease to have any use. In that supreme state of Changeless Peace, there is no speech at all. *There* the souls in their absorbed state cannot say *either one or two.*

The saying there is neither 'Thou' nor 'I,' is simply a method adopted to teach the *Sivôhambhâvana*|| practice of Sariya, Kiriya, Yoga and Gnana. For, in reality, *Thou art a Being as well as I am a being.* Then what is meant by saying 'There is no individual existence as ego or 'I'?¶ *Thou* knowest it well. How can those percieve it who are yet not free from their anava or ignorance? To make them know it, there is nothing else we can pitch upon to compare with the *Moksha* state or *anubhava.*

* Nelli is a kind of Indian fruit of grape-like appearance.

† Vide 41st verse with notes.

‡ The 3 essential Logical methods are (1) Prathiatcha (observation and experiment) (2) Anumàna (Inference) and (3) Agama (Testimony or Authority). Vide p. 3 of *Siddhanta Deepika* Vol. I. where my esteemed brother Mr. Nallaswami Pillai gives fuller details.

§ Anubhava—experience.

|| Vide notes to 53rd verse and *c. f* 91st verse with notes.

¶ It means that the soul can only live and act by its co-existence with the Lord and by the power of the *Lord;* just as consonants can sound only by the help of the vowel. '*a*'. *c. f.* verses 8, 25, 50 with notes.

Do Thou help me, O The Supreme End and Aim of my solemn initiation by my Guru Mauni, the silent teacher, by the Symbol of True Gnana.

காயாத மரமீது கல்லேறு செல்லுமோ
கடவுணீ யாங்களடியேம்
கர்மபந் தத்தினாற் சன்மபந் தம்பெறக்
கற்பித்த தின்னதருளே
வாயார வுண்டபேர் வாழ்த்துவது நொந்தபேர்
வைவதுவு மெங்களுலக
வாய்பாடு நிற்கநின் வைதிக வொழுங்குநினை
வாழ்த்தினாற் பெறுபேறுதான்
ஓயாது பெறுவனென முறையிட்ட தாற்பின்ன
ருளறுவது கருமமன்றும்
உபயநெறி யீதென்னி னுசிதநெறி யெந்தநெறி
யுலகிலே பிழைபொறுக்கும்
தாயான கருணையு முனக்குண் டெனக்கினிச்
சஞ்சலங் கெடவருள்செய்வாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே.

107. O *Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

No stones will be aimed at a tree which bears no fruits. So it is but Thy Grace that does set us (souls) to the cycle of evolution and that invokes our love of devotion and prayer to Thee; Thyself being our Benevolent Lord (*Pathi*)* and ourselves Thy dependent slaves (*Pasus*) suffering under the *pasa bhanda* or bonds of life.

But it has been the rule of custom in this world of evolution that those, who have had their hunger appeased, praise Thee and those who have to suffer from want, upbraid Thee. Of these two methods, the first is the commendable one. And the vicious act of upbraiding Thee has to be avoided indeed, inasmuch as the Vedagamas proclaim† that it is only by Thy adoration and praise that the souls can achieve the Highest End of *Siva-Sayujya.*‡

Since Thou possessest *also* the motherly Forbearance and Grace, do Thou, my Lord, cause my mental agonies to disappear.

R. Shanmuga Mudaliar.

(*To be continued*).

* *c. f.* 25th verse and notes to '*Pasupathi.*'

† *c. f.* notes to 37th verse.

‡ *c. f.* notes to 41st verse for 'Siva-Sayujya.'

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, OCTOBER 1898.

ANCIENT TAMILIAN CIVILIZATION.

We extract elsewhere from the *Indian Social Reformer,* what appeared in its editorial columns and notes, on the 'Pioneers of South Indian Civilization.' The subject is one which, as may well be conceived, was nearest our heart and we were postponing its consideration from a variety of causes, and we have to thank our learned contemporary for giving us a chance, by his characteristic outspokenness, for stating our own views more fully and thus remove some misconceptions from his mind as regards our real position. There is an absurd sentiment abroad, known by some high sounding (meaningless) names which is thoroughly destructive of independence of thought and honest criticism, and before which, as we will show, even the boldest and truest minds have quailed. Its baneful influence is being felt in the cause of religion, and humanity and truth. To proceed with our subject, we wish to settle the terminology by which we can describe South India and the South Indian people. Nobody dares now use 'Turanian', though we used to hear it in our school-boy days. 'Dravidian' was brought into use by the late Bishop Caldwell, but even this is dropping out of use. 'South India,' 'South Indian people' and 'South Indian languages' are more often used now but even these are too unwieldy and cumbersome. We want a word as elegant and as short as 'Aryan,' and no better word than 'Tamilian' can be thought of. The Reverend Dr. Pope gives reasons for giving preference to this word, in his first paper on the 'Poets of the Tamil lands,' contributed to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* and which we extracted in our columns. The people of Malabar see no objection to it. The difficulty is with the Canarese and Telugu people. The Canarese people would seem to occupy a back seat now for literary purposes. They do not seem to know themselves nor their relations to their neighbours. Even they can be made to see how purely Tamil is their language and customs. When we heard some Canarese songs, the quaint old harmony of the *Devara* hymns seemed to strike our ears. The Telugu people have been the worst to subject themselves to Sanscritic influences, and they will be the most difficult people to be dealt with. However we wish to give greater currency to Dr. Pope's choice. The oldest Tamil writers spoke of '*Vada-mori,*' and '*Ten-mori,*' and '*Aryam* and Tamil,' and to them it did not seem to have occurred that any other language could stand in comparison, much less in opposition to these two. Saint Appar speaks of God, "ஆரியந்தமிழோ டிசையானவன்" Saint Thirumular also speaks of Aryam and Tamil as the only primaeval languages (*vide* stanza 9, p. 81 of this volume). Saint Gnanasambantha considers Aryan and Tamil as the only two languages worth learning. "ஆரியத்தொடு செந்தமிழ்ப்பயன் அறிகிலார்".

We next wish to note our perfect agreement with the views expressed by our contemporary, though we in no way fall back from our views already expressed by us in these pages. Our friends well know that we have been expressing these views ever so long in private, and we however communicated them in brief in a letter to the *Weekly Review* (Madras) sometime in 1896 and we extract the whole article here, as its importance is more felt by what we hear of certain doings from Sivakasi.

"Dr. Pulny Andy's hobby.—In *re* your editorial note on Dr. Pulny Andy's hobby, permit me to make the following observations. As in some of these questions you can look at a thing from many points of view, you may consider the question from its historical bearings, how these castes originated and whether and when these underwent changes, &c., and the questions which thus open up are of vast importance. Several of the castes have thus received interest; and among them Vanniyas call themselves Kshatriyas and the Shanars call themselves also Kshatriyas, and these two castes with the Kammalas, being rich and intelligent, are able to fight out their own way. The Kurumbers are a much despised and backward community; but European antiquarians have come to their help, and the Revd. Foulkes supposes that they with the Vanniyas are the remnants of the old pre-Chola dynasties of Chalukyas &c. Of course I do not belong to any of these castes and consequently cannot be accused of taking sides. Still I am bound to say their claims have some sort of foundation or

other. But there is one fundamental fallacy in the consideration of this question and which fallacy has been pointed out and yet ignored in other fields than in questions of Ethnology. The fallacy is to seek for sanction and precepts from the Vedas and other Sanscrit books for a people who are essentially Tamilians. It is my view *that Tamilians were not derived directly from the settlers in the north during the Indian Vedic days, and that the Tamilians did not emigrate from the north of India to the south* **by choices or by force**; *that they are not to be identified with the people whom the Vedic settlers encountered and called Dasyus; that if they did settle in the south from outside, they did so* **by the sea and not by land** *and through mountain ranges, and that they came from Assyria and Asiatic Minor, the oldest seat of ancient civilization. I further think, that once they entered India by the western sea-gate they spread themselves rapidly over the whole of South India up to the Dandakaranya and the Vindhya which at that time must have been impassable, and that they developed their letters and arts and sciences and law and Government which, at the time, they came in contact with the northern settlers, must have been in a sense perfect.* About the same time or probably later, the Vedic people settled in the north and developed their arts and civilization; and perhaps, for thousands of years, the people in the north had no idea of the people of the south, and if they had any, they probably stood in the relation of Lord Salisbury's blackman and the orthodox Brahmin's white barbarian. The point which I wish to draw out is, that the Vanniyas or Shanars may have occupied positions of as much respectability as they now claim among the orginal Tamil people; but probably suffered a disgrace when the Brahmans came down to the south and effected their own supremacy by flattering the ruling princes by telling them they are descended from the illustrious race of the Sun and the Moon. On the other hand, it is difficult to account for the fact, of the great ruling dynasties of the south having left no trace whatever. The case of the Candian exiles in the presidency has given me a clue. After their exile here, they have contracted relationships with some of the indigenous Balija class and call themselves Naidus and, in course of time, all traces of their origin will be completely washed out of their minds or if they do, nobody will easily believe their claims. I doubt not therefore that when one dynasty upset a previous one, the latter were forced to flee the country and seek homes elsewhere, and there, hide their name and origin and become hewers of wood and drawers of water and undertake such low occupations, as were despised by the other sections of the community who found favour or were tolerated by the new dynasty. Such questions therefore derive importance in one way, namely, if these despised castes should recognize their old high position and should therefore bestir themselves and strive to better their position by education, &c., I should say they should have all honour and glory. In such a case, a quiet laugh from an outsider will not be meet at all. *Of course, as I have already stated, there is an element of absurdity in their adopting and identifying themselves with such foreign names as Brahman or Kshatriya, in the same way as a high class Hindu should assume European dress and call himself an European.* (I purposely abstain *from another comparison which their enemies* would suggest.) Apart from these considerations, of course, the question is of no moment to any party and the historical and antiquarian interest altogether being wanting in the Indian he is disposed no doubt to treat this question offhand. *The question, however, which I have raised here, in regard to the distinct origin and development of the Tamils and Aryans, is of very great importance though it has attracted very few writers in the field, though the able dissertation of Mr. Nelson is an important contribution to the subject so far as the domains of South Indian Law is considered.*"—The *Weekly Review.*

We refer more particularly to the portions italicized, and we may be allowed to say that we were the first to broach the notion that the Tamilians had no sort of connection with the north or the northern settlers, and they never derived their letters or arts or civilization from the Aryans, or at any rate, we never before remember to have seen or met with the theory suggesting a sea-route across the Arabian Sea from Assyria. The theory most prevalent some decades back was the aboriginal theory. Then came the theory that they were aborigines conquered by the invading Aryans, who called them Dasyus and drove them south. Then came the theory, the latest, that they were also Aryans or pre-Aryans, like the Celts and Cymri in Ireland who were gradually forced down south. In regard to the Tamil language itself, our old Tamil Professor—no—Superintendent of Tamil studies,—himself a Tamilian from the extreme South, used to hold forth that it was derived altogether from the Sanscrit, though his successor in the chair spoke of the affinities lying deeper between Sanscrit and Tamil, and spoke of the two peoples living together in the father land, at a very remote time, and used to derive every Tamil word from Sanscrit by all sorts of tortuous processes. We were however inclined to think at one time that the relation of Tamil to Sanscrit would be like that of Anglo-Saxon to Latin and Greek; and though this may be true still to a certain extent as regards the outermost polish, yet this could not be true as regards the origin of the two peoples and their languages. Nearly all these theories

suggested a connection with the North somehow or other and we had first to disabuse our mind of all such notions and the main lines of argument we followed were the following. The Tamil people do not bear any marks of a conquered race. If they are, rather we should say, were, proud of any one thing it was of their independence, and as it is his speech which brings out a man's real nature, we see in the Tamil language a vigor, and independence displayed which is unparalled in the history of the world amidst similar surroundings. The early Tamil writers were so scrupulous as not to admit foreign words and their influence must have been so great at one time that even Aryan writers dared not take liberties with the language. Its influence was so great that it brought the whole body of Aryan settlers in the South under its complete sway, so that we have, as we had already remarked, very few works of any importance written in Sanscrit by South Indian Aryans before the 8th and 9th centuries after Christ. It was not the case of the Aryans taking the Tamilians under their wings at first; though there can be no doubt that under the later Dynasties of Pandya, Chera and Chola which upset the previous and more genuine Tamil Dynasties, they gained more in power and influence. If a conquered race, they cannot boast of a proverb, "ஓதுவாரெல்லாம் உழுவான் புறக்கடையில்," 'all the learned men (brahmins) wait at the gate of the cultivator', which by the way expresses the dignity of labour in no measured terms. The Tamilians never, at any time, called themselves 'Dasa,' as do the people of the North and it is in the so-called more civilized districts, and among the more civilized non-Brahmins, that the term Sudra is used, and one Tamil writer tried to bring into use the words Sat-sudra (சற் சூத்திரன்) and Asat-sudra (அசற் சூத்திரன்); otherwise each one called himself by his respective calling, trade, or profession. There was no castes then, unless the social distinctions into முதலியார்* இடையர் and கடையர் can be called so. Till within half of a century or so, all the real temporal power, all the land, all the wealth, and the professions were confined to the non-Brahmin classes, though there were no doubt exceptions to the rule. The terms அய்யர்,† அந்தணர், பார்ப்பார், ஓதுவார், which were common names at first to describe the learned, and which were subsequently applied to the Brahman settlers, shows in what character they became known to the Tamilians for the first time and when they came. They had teachers, and writers and bards and sages among themselves and so could appreciate these new people. If they were not a conquered race, they would not have found their way to the south by mere choice, leaving the most fertile Indus and Gangetic plains, crossing those formidable obstacles of the Vindhya and Dhandakaranya. The story of Agastya subduing the power of the Vindhya Mountain refers evidently to the fact of the Brahmin being the first to cross to the Tamil country, and his learning Tamil from the Supreme Siva cannot be mistaken in its import. When the story of Ramayana opens, we see Agastya already settled in the Tamil country and though we find that other stray settlers a little to the north, were molested by the tribes living there, yet Agastya is reported to be all powerful in the extreme South, having conciliated the people and become one with them; and the Ramayana records that it was through his influence, the exiled and despairing Rama got the Pasupathastra from Siva *i.e.* the co-operation and support of the Tamil tribes to recover his lost wife from the hands of the chief of Singalese (a fierce people even now) whose country was not so far removed from the main land as now. And there can be no excuse for the writer of the Ramayana for his ungrateful and ungenerous travesty of the Tamilians, and the gross exaggerations and hyperboles he deals with; and the only excuse could be that he was altogether ignorant of the Tamil people. Oriental Scholars say that the work itself is later than the actual composition of Mahabharata, and if so, the book should have been written from a worse cause than mere ignorance. The very next work in order of date, as it is usually reckoned, is the Mahabharata, and we find that at that time, the Tamil land had a settled form of Government and a polity, and the conquering hero could only hope to achieve his object by intermarriage. The position of woman was one of complete subordination under the Aryan Polity, and we do not hear of a single princess who held sole regal sway. On the other hand the position of women in the Tamil land is that of an equal, if not more, as in Malabar, and the Heads of the Pandi and the Kerala were Queens.

If therefore they did not come from the north, they must have formed the aborigines or if they came from outside, where did they come from? If we can

* In the oldest Tamil works Brahmins are called Mudaliyars. In Ceylon, it is still conferred by Government as a title.

† In the old pial schools, the pupils addressed their teacher always as அய்யர், whatever the caste of the latter may have been.

forget for a while our prejudice against the word aborigines, and if we can believe in the tradition of there having been a vast continent south of Cape Comorin, whence all humanity and civilization flowed east and west and north, then there can be nothing strange in our regarding the Tamilians as the remnants of a pre-deluvian race. Even the existing works in Tamil faintly speak of 3 separate deluges which completely swamped the extreme southern shores and carried off with it all its literary treasures of ages. And it stands to reason why, in South India, unlike in ancient Chaldea and Babylon, none of the old records of the pre-historic civilization are absolutely not forthcoming. The Palmleaf, the readiest material and the most fragile one which the Tamilians had, must also account for it. However, this theory stands on no historical or scientific footing. And when we remembered that the earliest route known to the Europeans was by the sea and that even in days of King Solomon, there was a brisk trade between his country and Western India, and from what Dr. Caldwell had pointed out there were a number of Tamil words in the Hebrew and when it was known that there were a large number of words common to the Tamil and Assyrian or Sumerian, and what important part the monsoon winds play in the Arabian Gulf, it does not seem improbable to conclude that the first settlers in Western India must have been sailors or merchants coasting along the Arabian Sea who were driven thitherward by adverse winds and stranded. In this connection, we publish below extracts from the correspondence we had with the late lamented Professor P. Sundaram Pillai. The argument turned on the fact whether the original of a certain work was Sanscrit or Tamil, and he held that it was the latter against the received tradition and he wrote to say (letter dated 31st March 1896).

* * * * * *

"On the contrary, the 2nd point of difference implies a substantial divergence of views with respect to the *Historic* position of our Saiva Religion and Philosophy. With all deference to the Vedas, which have subsequently become the Dravidian as well as the Aryan Bible, I believe the Saiva system of thought and worship *peculiarly* our own. With our usual complaisance we have surrendered our right to it, no less than to the temples which, you know, were originally constructed by us and administered entirely by our குருக்கள் and which it is now a pollution for them to enter and worship with அர்ச்சனை &c. கைரயான் புற்றெடுக்கப் பாம்பு குடியிருக்கும் is a significant proverb applicable in many ways to the history of the poor Dravidian race. Please think over the matter calmly and in the spirit of *historical criticism*. I can't hope to convince you of the truth of my statement in the course of a letter however long."

* * * * * *

We wrote in reply that though we differed in regard to the particular book in question, we were in the main agreed as to the independence of the Tamil race. This brought a reply on 19th December 1896.

* * * * * *

"I am glad, indeed, you are feeling your way to accept the truth I conveyed to you by the proverb of the snake and white ants. I regret I have not yet been able to formulate my theory for popular conviction: but am doing what I can to prepare the minds of gentlemen like you from Ceylon to Bangalore for the full recognition of the truth when publicly announced. The Vellalas who form the flower of the Dravidian race have now so far forgotten their nationality as to habitually think and speak of themselves as Sudras (and even more stupidly as Vaisyas) exactly as the ignorant among them call themselves in courts of law as of அஞ்ஞானமதம் at the bidding of the so-called வேதக்காரர் Christians. In fact to tell them that they are no more Sudras than Frenchmen and that the Aryan polity of castes was the cunningly forged fetters by which their earliest enemies—the Aryans of the North—bound their souls which is worse than binding hands and feet might sound too revolutionary a theory, though historically but a bare fact. I have converted privately several to this opinion among the leaders of the community here and there: and I must go on with the work, sometime more, in the same noiceless fashion before I can trust myself to print. Most of what is ignorantly called Aryan Philosophy, Aryan civilization is literally Dravidian or Tamilian at bottom. The idea of *jenman*, of Karma of Maya and of Divine Grace or அருள் can be directly proved to be ours, and most of the great thinkers and philosophers and even poets who pass for Aryan are our men as Europeans are now beginning to find out. But I cannot go further just now in the course of this letter. Let the idea work in you and you will find enough of proof yourself. What a lamentable history is ours! It crushes my heart to think of it"!

* * * * * *

We also communicated to him the letter we wrote to the *Weekly Review* and he expressed his perfect agreement with us, though another Tamil Scholar asked us for our proofs. In the editorial contributed by him to the *Madras Standard* on 30th January 1897, under the heading of the 'Basic element of Hindu Civilization',

he took more courage and came out with his views in stronger language than in his letter, which we also extract, so that it may not go altogether into oblivion.

"THE history of Indian Civilization is the old story of the Giant and the Dwarf. The victories in it are the victories of the vaunting Aryan, while the wounds are the wounds of the bleeding pre-Aryan. Our Dwarf to boot is the most self-denying of ethnical units imaginable, claiming nothing, rejoicing in small mercies, and glorying in accepting any nickname his proud, disdainful, partner may be pleased to bestow on him. How much of the justly celebrated Hindu Philosophy, Hindu Literature and Hindu Learning may be due to the despised non-Aryan races of India, and how little to the Brahmins who appear long ago to have grasped the key to it, is perhaps the hardest problem that the scientific historian of India will ever have to encounter. To the people at large even the all-important ethnical distinction of Aryan and non-Aryan is as good as inconceivable. Even the best educated among the latter are lost in the senseless scramble to rise to the supposed superior grades of Aryan castes, as little applicable to them as to the members of the 'celestial empire.' Those of them who have learned to call themselves the *Sudras* '*the wretched*' exactly as the ignorant Hindu complacently speaks of himself as of 'Ajnana Matham' at the bidding of the Christian missionary, consider it the acme of social elevation to be known as *Vysias*, meaning simply the masses or the people at large, while the classes below them such as the *Shanars* or the *Elavas* aspire to the name of Kshatriyas, probably on the principle of asking for a thousand in the hope of getting a hundred. How ludicrous, and yet how melancholy, are the efforts made by a Vellala, a Coorg, a Kayasta to shuffle off the natural dignity of his own independent non-Aryan position and to pass muster as a Vaisya, *a man of the masses*! It will take long, long, indeed, therefore, for native scholars to shake off the shackles of current notions, and to face the problem with the requisite calmness and independence of thought. Till then, we have to depend only on European research, subject to all the disadvantages that foreign scholarship is naturally heir to. Already with the best among the *savants* of Europe and America such as Goldstucker, Muir, Max Muller, Cowel, Deussen Charles Johnston, and others, the truth has found unreserved acceptance that the ground-work of Hindu Philosophy is *not* Brahminical, that neither the doctrine of an all-embracing supraconscious Brahman nor of an Atma bent upon absorption into it, nor again of Maya, of Karma, or metampsychosis is consistent or compatible with the system of ceremonials and "the milking of Gods" for material advantages which alone the early Aryan invader of India was capable of conceiving as religion. Most of the Upanishads—those hoary compilations which still continue to be the wonder of the world—contain internal evidences of a most unmistakable character of their origin in an altogether different tribe, red in colour as opposed to the white foreigner, but subsequently admitted into the Aryan polity under the name of the Kshatriyas. Pregnant with history is the declaration of King Pravahana in the *Brihad Aranyaka* when addressing Uddalaka, the Brahmin, he says: "*This wisdom never hitherto dwelt in any Brahman.*" A Rajanya, like Pravahana was Visvamitra, the author of the *Gayatri*—the holiest of the Brahmin holies—and to the same non-Aryan tribe belonged Buddha—the Light of the East—and of a tribe, though somewhat different, being the black one, but yet equally pre-Aryan and Scythian, was born Krishna whose divine song is so unparalleled in beauty and in truth.

"But the attempt to find the basic element of Hindu civilization by a study of Sanscrit and the history of Sanscrit in Upper India is to begin the problem at its worst and most complicated point. India south of the Vindhyas, the Peninsular India, still continues to be India proper, Here the bulk of the people continue distinctly to retain their pre-Aryan features, their pre-Aryan languages, their pre-Aryan social institutions. Even here, the process of Aryanization has gone indeed too far to leave it easy for the historian to distinguish the native warp from the foreign woof. But if there is anywhere any chance of such successful disentanglement, it is in the South; and the further South we go, the larger does the chance grow. The scientific historian of India then ought to begin his study with the basin of the Krishna, of the Cauvery, of the Vaiga rather than with the Gangetic plain as it has been now long, too long, the fashion.

"It is impossible, therefore, to exaggerate the value of any undertaking which endeavours in any direction to expand our general knowledge of the South—our knowledge of the ancient Dravidian civilization, Dravidian Literature, Philosophy or Religion, the vestiges of which in however altered a garb, do still present themselves at every turn. Of these, the Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy is by no means the least important. It has been justly styled by that able and amiable Tamil scholar—Dr. Pope—'the choicest product of the Dravidian intellect.'"

It is melancholy to note that the Professor had actually started from his home, just before his death, on a lecturing tour, and alas! The country has lost altogether the matured wisdom of a cultured Tamilian. We, however, think he made a mistake in coupling and confusing the North Indian non-Brahmins and Tamilians. As we are afraid our article is spun out a good deal, we stop to-day, hoping to pursue the theme at a more convenient moment.

LORD SAMBANDHA AND AN UNKNOWN *TAMILIAN* PROSODY.

Tamilian Prosody unsuspected.

It is not easy to trace the existence of any prosody common to the languages of the *Tamilian* group. No body ever suspects that the prosody of Tamil can have anything to do with its sister languages. The prosodies of the *Tamilian* languages seem to differ so immensely and so radically from each other that one hardly suspects the possibiliy of detecting anything common to them. No doubt the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese are apparently identical with a few points of deviation. Malayalam, we hear, has nothing more than Sanskrit prosody, a fact shewing the recent origin of its poetry. But the establishment of a common *Tamilian* prosody with the comparative history of the several prosodies of the *Tamilian* languages has been not only an impossible task but altogether an unsuspected fact solely on account of the greatest obscurity in which Tamil prosody has ever been involved and the extreme and surprising scautines of its treatment by Tamil writers. There has ever been a great disproportion between the immense and ever-growing poetical fields of Tamil literature and the inflexible nature of its limited prosody which was apparently completed in ancient days and could not consistently with its ancient dignity be interfered with in the opinion of Tamil prosodians.

Tamil prosody resembles English Common Law.

Tamil prosody may be instructively compared to the ancient Common Law of England 'having completed its development in the sense that a girl completes her education and having suddenly grown prim and dry and become to a great extent *'a Jus strictum,'* that is to say, a system positive and inflexible and one which is unable to accommodate itself to the exigencies of a larger world than the school in which it had been formed." But the defects of the Engiish Common Law have been in time remedied by its handmaid equity and it is a mystery why Tamil prosody which has become unfit for further development and which no writer who had any reverence for antiquity could venture to tamper with, has not been supplemented as Common Law was by equity. The result was that Tamil versification has grown into a mass of the wildest confusion unarranged, unclassified, unscanned, undescribed, unnamed and undistinguished. The verses sometimes, in consequence, overlap and mix with each other in a hopelessly inextricable confusion. If it were not for the high intellectual energy of its poets, Tamil prosody would long ago have lost all vitality and collapsed into a lifeless mass. It is wonderful how even in the midst of this utter confusion, the minutest *Tamilian* principles have been preserved unimpaired by poets in the course of a large many centuries.

Tamil versification a wilderness.

Tamilian Prosody unknown because Tamil Prosody unexplored.

It is therefore the defective and cramped nature of Tamil prosody that is responsible for our not detecting and grasping the common metrical principles of the *Tamilian* languages. Perhaps no other language at the time of its greatest prosperity possessed such an immensely wide field of versification and yet no other language so totally neglected its prosody and accorded such a perfunctory treatment bequeathing to us a nominal prosody so unworthy of its vast poetical literature. If Tamil had possessed a complete prosody quite commensurate to its vast literature like its sister languages, a glance through these prosodies would long ago have enabled any reader to detect their common ground.

Divisions of *Tamilian* Prosody.

Tamilian prosody may be divided into three periods, *viz.*, (1) the Pre-*Tamilic* period, (2) The *Tamilic* period, (3) The Sanskrit period. Tamil flourished through all the three periods. Telugu and Canarese belong only to the 2nd and 3rd periods and Malayalam only to the 3rd.

Pre-*Tamilic* Prosody.

During the Pre-*Tamilic* period, the four main metres of Tamil flourished *viz.*, அகவல், வெள்ளை, வஞ்சி and கலி. Of these four, அகவல் which is a little better than prose was the earliest and next to it was வெள்ளை. These two were the primary main metres of the language and are coeval with Tamil prosody itself. From அகவல் it would appear வஞ்சி is derived and வெண்பா has given birth to கலிப்பா. These two therefore are the derivative metres.

Non-existence of other prosodies during this period.

There is nothing in Telugu and Canarese prosodies that bears any resemblance to these metres or the principles that govern them. The Tamil metrical formulæ must have come into existence at this period and are quite unsuited to the other languages. There is no such thing as வெண்டளை elsewhere though it plays such an important part in Tamil metres. The

Tamil formula விளங்கனி is quite foreign to the prosodies of the other lauguages and has never been recognised as a foot. The absence of any such similarities as also of ancient poems in those other languages points to the fact that those languages had no poetry worth the name during this period when these metres came into existence and flourished. The Tamil prosody of this period is full, complete and exhaustive. Tholkappiam belongs to this period. Perhaps no prosodians have so much exhausted their energies over their verses as the Tamil prosodians of this period did in the investigation of these ancient Tamil metres. A glance at some of the commentaries shews what a large number of metrical works on prosody flourished during this period and our bitterest complaint is that not even a small share of this attention has ever been bestowed on the much more important poetry of the next *Tamilic* period.

Tamilic Prosody.

The next period is the *Tamilic* poetry when the *Tamilic* metres arose and flourished. Though Tamil, Telugu and Canarese poetries flourished during this period, it was Tamil that seems to have flourished most and to have been richest in *Tamilian* metres.

Sambandha's Poetry.

We have simply to open the inimitable pages of our Lord Sambandha to understand the profuse richness of Tamil poetry during this Tamilic period. We are able to point out nearly one hundred metrical varieties in his Poetry. Was there ever, we ask, any poet, ancient or modern, in any language on the face of the earth not excluding Sanskrit, who has so spontaneously and with such an insatiable thirst for the praise of his Divine Father in Heaven, sung on that same subject so many interesting varieties of lovely verses as nearly one hundred—varieties not based on small distinctions such as are recognised in Sanskrit but differing as widely as any two metres of a language—leaving of course out of consideration the verses which are alleged to have perished ? We fear the unparalleled poetical excellences of Sambandha have not been thoroughly understood, appreciated, and admired. We, in our supreme and blissful ignorance of the history of this period, glance at his metres with indifference and sometimes with surprise and nay, with contempt. In fact Lord Sambanda has overflooded the Tamil land with an enormous number of metres of unknown varieties and of unsurpassed perfection, accuracy and beauty and how have we profited by the heavy rains? What have we but a few pools in the poems of a few poets to remind us of the heavy rains having allowed all the precious waters to run down into the salt sea? Perhaps our Lord was too high for the simple poets and the simpler people of the Tamil land. We have neglected Tamil Prosody, we have neglected Sambandh's Poetry and what wonder is it that the existence of *Tamilian* Prosody has been unknown to us. We dont read Sambhanda's Poetry because it does not contain any vain philosophic disquisitions or learned commentaries on Vedanta or an ingenious attempt at an Advaitic or Siddhantic interpretation of the Gita or even a faithful record of the much advanced metaphysical experiences of the author. These are more or less vain and pedantic productions of simple men struggling successfully or oftener unsuccessfully for knowledge. But Sambandha's poetry shines far above these cloudy controversial regions like the lofty towering peak in Goldsmith's poetry. Even his biographer, his most ardent and enthusiastic lover and admirer, has not drawn the attention of the world to the unparalleled poetical source of his greatness. Evidently he thought slightly if it as being of a trivial nature. But to us living at this remote period, this is the only light by which all of us could see him and the only point through which he is accessible to all of us. We, philosophers find nothing in him to quote, not even so much as we find in Appar nor is there allusion to any subtle point of Theology such as we are sure to find even in the dullest Tamil poet. If it were not for our Lord, we would have no traces of the poetry of this period and any attempt at the establishment of anything like Tamilic poetry would prove wholly futile. The poetry of the first period is completely explained in Tholkappium and the works that followed.

Unexplained.

In fact, all the works on Tamil prosody following in his footsteps relate principally to the poetry of the 1st period and if any writer ventured beyond, it was only to say, by a sweeping remark that *Vrittahs* are a secondary class of metres having four equal lines and nothing more; and the unfortunate poetry of this *Tamilic* period therefore has to this day remained obscure and unexplained, so that it has become a problem whether it is capable of complete and satisfactory explanation at all.

Pandit's view.

We imagine the Tamil Pandits might argue that we do not require any classification or nomenclature for Vrittahs as they may be understood by a reader of average

abilities in the course of his studies. Such an imaginary student must really be a prodigy. Are any metres left to be explored by the student himself in Sanskrit or any other language ? We do not wish to rely upon the blunders committed by the modern Pandits as they have acquired their proficiency in the most discouraging circumstances. We are here reminded of a fault in a book containing nothing more than a string of illustrative metres where a metre like the opening stanzas of Thayumanavar occurs as illustrative of எழுசீர். We fondly hoped to discover it was a mistake. The preceding metre is அறுசீர் and the succeeding one எண்சீர் and there can therefore be no doubt that the metre in question has been regarded as எழுசீர். We need hardly point out that the metre is அறுசீர். But we can hardly believe that the illustrious author to whom it is attributed could be guilty of it We are rather inclined to believe that it was not his production as is very common in Hindu literature. The best editions of classical works contain faults in the arrangement of metres. The faults are too many to be passed over as oversights. While the same metre is continued, the editors mark it somewhere as வேறு and a different metre is passed over in silence as continuation of same metre without any such note. Such blunders on the part of editors we can point out in scores. But we are unwilling to undertake such an unpleasant task as it will unnecessarily offend the well earned fame of industrious editors. The same class of metres is fully treated in the other *Tamilian* languages. Of course the Pandit's argument is hardly sound enough to require notice and refutation. But a complete answer to the argument is found in the fact that the neglect of these metres has led to a most disastrous consequence *viz*, the poetry of our Lord Sambandha is unintelligible to the modern critical reader. Tamil versification has been undergoing various changes while it was left to drift along and take care of itself; and it is a matter for congratulation that it has not met with any serious accident by being wrecked and dashed to pieces. Our sympathies are more for the ancient metres which are very scientific, as some of the modern ones seem to be nothing more than accidental forms assumed by ancient ones when they have been left to drift for themselves through centuries

Ancient and modern Tamilic period in Tamil.

This *Tamilic* period is divisible into ancient and modern, so far as Tamil poetry is concerned. There can be no doubt that our verses differ in a great many points from those of the days of Sambandha. A large many metres have altogether disappeared and it would be pedantic on the part of a modern writer to attempt to revive them again; and even those that have had the energy to survive the destroying hand of time are so unlike their ancient prototypes that one can even question their identity; and even where their identity is clear, there are very many serious points of deviation and difference which require satisfactory explanation. A good many principles were in use formerly which would now be considered as gross blunders attributable to ignorance.

No such division in Telugu and Canarese.

No such division as ancient, and modern is apparent in the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese. At least the prosodians, we believe, have laid down no such distinction. Their metres are all of one period, governed by one set of principles presenting no difficulties or irregularities and have never drifted along without the guiding hand of a pilot to meet with various accidents and assume fanciful and unscientific forms though by accident appearing to be measured and harmonius. They were the same throughout, governed by the same principles, without any accidental or other forms and none of them died out. They are altogether as perfect, regular, intelligible and reducible to principles as modern Tamil metres are.

Telugu and Canarese a key to Lord Sambandha.

But their great importance to us consists in the fact that they throw some light on the question of the solution of ancient metres, especially those of Sambandha. They contain a few metres which seem to occur in Sambandha and other old poets. It will be impossible to understand these metres of Sambandha on any principles known to Tamil Pandits or recognised in their prosodies or deducible from modern poetry. *But, they become perfectly intelligible, scientific and admirable metres when we look at them iu the light of principles assumed in Telugu and Canarese prosodies.* But we regret the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese do not contain more *Tamilic* metres than they now possess. Telugu Pandits tell us that there is no work extant earlier than their Nannaya Bhatta's Bharata. It is therefore not easy to decide whether in those languages there did not flourish more *Tamilic* metres which we meet with in Sambandha and for which we look for similarities in vain in those languages, than what are explained in their prosodies. If Telugu and Canarese Pandits would co-operate with us

and discover earlier works containing old metres, we believe and fondly hope they will contain metres similar to those found in Sambandha and some of the Alwars and we may then hope completely to understand and admire these poets.

Old Telugu and Canarese poems to be discovered.

The earlier works in Telugu were very probably neglected and consigned to oblivion or allowed to perish from too fond a predilection for Sanskrit and its metres. Even at the present day, the Telugu Pandit as well as poet cares more for Sanskrit metres than the *Tamilian* verses. The admixture of *Tamilian* verses in Telugu poetry has been gradually diminishing from the time of Nannaya Bhatta and we have even heard a very learned Telugu Pandit remark with reference to some of the non-Sanskrit verses that they are fit only for women and lower classes. Fortunately the Tamil poets have not lost their heads by this Sanskrit mania and we are glad to note that the influx of Sanskrit metres into Tamil has not been able to stifle out of existence or drive into obscurity the non-Sanskrit verses. Telugu and Canarese writers open their prosodies with Sanskrit metres and their own verses occupy only a secondary importance at the end.

Tamilian metres neglected in Telugu and Canarese.

We now proceed to point out and explain the Telugu and Canarese metres occurring in our Lord Sambandha.

Telugu and Canarese metres in Sambandha.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B.A., B.L.

(*To be continued*).

EXTRACT.

The following extracts we take from the *Indian Social Reformer* under date October 2, 1898.

THE PIONEERS OF SOUTH INDIAN CIVILIZATION.

In his interesting paper on "National Progress" which we published in two recent issues, Mr. M. Tillanayagam Pillay who is entitled to speak with authority, confirms the observations we had to make with reference to Mr. V. Runga Rao's remark at the Mangalore Hindu Social Reform Association, that the Brahmans were only a microscopic minority and that the social evils peculiar to them were of no importance to the community in general. "It is the Brahmins" said Mr. Tillanayagam Pillay " that brought light and civilization to Southern India. Their example is followed by the other castes who look to them for their regeneration. Let us entreat our educated Brahmin friends, then, to be more humane to their child-widows and prove themselves to be the enlightened conductors of their Hindu brethren, and to lead them on in the path of progress and reformation necessary under the present state of culture, just in the same way as their forefathers did centuries ago, according to their lights." So far as the above relates to the facts of the present day, it is in accord with our own view of the situation. But we cannot accept without question the statement that it was the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India, nor admit that the non-Brahman Hindus, at the present time when the avenues of culture and progress are open alike to all, when no class is placed under in any special disabilities, and when the administration exercises an indirect but powerful influence in bringing up the classes long looked down upon as beyond the people, are justified in hanging to the coat-tails or rather to the holy thread of the Brahman. For one thing such a procedure is not conducive to their self-respect, and for another, the holy thread of the modern Brahman, made in Manchester and renewed at long intervals, is scarcely equal to the strain. This is, however, an aspect of the present position of the Hindus, that could be best enforced from the non-Brahmin side. It is the view popularly held that " it is the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India," that we desire to examine in this article. If the statement means anything it means that Southern India before the advent of the Brahmans was plunged in Cimmerian darkness. There was no light, no civilization. The people had perhaps not as yet emerged from the hunting stage. Social and political virtues were unknown or held in abeyance until the Brahmans came and

> Waved his sceptre o'er his kind
> By Nature's first great title, Mind.

It is not our intenion, it is certainly not to our interest, to minimise or depreciate whatever services the ancestors of the Brahmans might have rendered to Southern India. That they rendered good service is beyond doubt. In one of the numbers in a previous volume we have specified and eulogised the benefits conferred on the country by Brahmanical influence. It is, however, one thing to make an admission of this kind, and quite a different thing to assert that " it is the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India." The history of Southern India is as yet very much of a sealed book, but enough is known of it throw serious suspicion upon the claim of the Brahman to be regarded as the pioneer of light and civilization in that part of the country. The fact that Southern India so rapidly assimilated the more important features of the Brahmanical civilization, is itself proof that it had undergone previous to its contact with that civilization a process of preparation quite incompatible with the lightless condition that some people would assign to it. Even the *Siddhanta Deepika* which is wedded to a theory which assigns no mean position to the Brahman in the evolution of South Indian life, speaks in its last number " the very first settlement of North Indian Aryans in the Tamil land, who *soon after their settlement, indentified themselves completely* with the Tamil people," and of " feeling of social unity which prevailed in those times between the Aryans and Tamils," and adduces in support that " till the time of Nilakanta and Sankara we have very few Sanskrit works of importance composed in Southern India," and also that 'Gnana Sambantha of the Kaundinya Gotra (a Vedic Gotra by the way) always calls himself very frequently 'Tamil Gnana Sambanthan.'" Was such rapid fusion and such social unity between " the very first settlement of Brahmans" and the Tamils possible if the one had the monoply of light and the other was a monster of darkness? This it may be objected is a *priori* argument. But is it not borne out by evidence of the presence

in Southern India in pre-Brahmanic times of certain features which require a high degree of civilization to develop and foster? The art of building, gold coins, a well developed language, a flourishing trade, truthfulness, reverence for law and order, ideas of God-head with which the Aryans had to compromise, the results of which compromise are visible to this day, and the communial village system are some of them.

"WE deal in our leading article, necessarily somewhat perfunctorily, with a statement made in his lecture on "National Progress" by Mr. M. Tillanayagam Pillay, regarding the part played by the Brahmans as pioneers of civilization in Southern India, which seems to admit of qualification. The following passage which we take from a learned article in the April number of the *Journal* of the *Royal Asiatic Society* of Great Britain and Ireland, on the "Early Commerce of Babylon with India" by Mr. J. Kennedy, throws some further light on the subject. (Mr. Kennedy's article, we may say, is directed to proving that the international commerce of India did not go so far back into antiquity as some scholars hold). "And now for the sea-trade with India," he writes. "There is ample proof that it flourished from the seventh century B. C; but did it exist earlier? The Dravidian race, which can be traced throughout the greater part of India and Mekran, must have come from the West; it was doubtless akin to the primitive Cushite populations of Arabia and Babylonia; and it dwelt along the seaboard from the entrance of the Persian Gulf to the Indus Delta. *** The Dravidians of Southern India were accustomed to the sea, and afterwards furnished a large proportion of the ships and sailors, not to say the pirates, on the Indian Ocean. So that, although the coasting, perilous, and uninviting, there is no obvious physical or ethnological reason why an early intercourse by sea should not have existed between India and the West'.

"MORE striking still is the following passage which we take from the same article, criticising the derivation of the Hebrew *qoph* (ape) from the Sanskrit Kapi. "The Hebrews must have known apes and their designations in Egypt; whereas if they had imported them from the West Coast of India, they could not fail to have imported their Tamil name. Rice, peacocks, sandal-wood, every unknown article which we find imported by sea into Babylon before the fifth century B. C *brought with it a Dravidian, not a Sanskrit, designation*; and had apes ever come by this route, they would have found no exception.'

A few quotations from another distinguished writer who has made a study of the subject: "The agricultural races who first ruled India have always been a hospitable and tolerant race, who received strangers and allowed them to take up unoccupied lands in the country without difficulty. They also admired these new comers and were impressed with their genius for organization and Government, and saw the advantages arising from their political system. The great and fundamental difference between this and the republican Government of the Munda village and state was the Turanian belief that a strong central Government ruled by a king was the best means of securing order and unity, and enforcing the observance of the Dravidian maxim that every man and woman must do his or her duty to the State." It was under this form of Government that the lands of India were gradually apportioned among villages united into provinces, and governed by the matriarchal Dravidians from the south, united with the Mons from the north-east; and though the cultivation was scanty, and large areas of land unsuited to the growing of rice and the other national crops were left unoccupied, yet the country must, under the rule of the matriarchal races, have attained a stage of civilization which not only attracted the cupidity of Northern immigrants, but also led to extensive emigration among the tribes living on the Western Coasts." The same writer describes the national character of the primitive Dravidians as "silent, self-contained, and indomitably obstinate." The Brahmans have always bulked largely in the vision of Indian life, but the foundations of national life, like the foundation of a building, are always hidden from view. If they were otherwise, if the foundation of a building be laid on the surface, the result would be inevitable collapse. Do our educated men sufficiently realise this at the present day?

"A FRIEND was complaining the other day that a gentleman who is to the front in all matters connected with and advantages derived from a certain important movement, has never subscribed a single pie to the funds of that movement. This is typical of the part played by the Brahmans in Indian history. He has taken a platform seat on every occasion, had arrogated to himself or insinuated himself into the most prominent positions in national life, has enjoyed the fruits of the industry and perseverance of his countrymen but he has been strictly adhering to his initial maxim that Brahmans should only take but not give. When years hence owing to the labours of scholars and archæologists, the real history of Southern India comes to be written, when the historian is enabled to penetrate behind appearances which are deceptive, the world will know how much the country is indebted to the silent, self-contained, indomitabe industry of the Dravidian people. Even to-day they are the backbone of our population.

REVIEWS.

I. The **Aitareya Upanishad*** (1st of the series). This is the first of the attempt by the editor and publisher to interpret the eleven Upanishads in Marathi, the vernacular of the Western Presidency; and a most commendable one it is. The masses all over India were satisfied till now with the Divine writings of their Saints who sang and spoke to them in their own vernaculars, though embodying all the best thoughts of these ancient writings. But the spirit of research and critical study induced by Western scholars and translators has also caused a revival of Sanscrit, and there is evidently a great demand among the masses to know the real contents of these ancient scriptures. We have no doubt also that once they have learned their contents, they will have to unlearn a great deal too. For the language, embodying as they do, the thoughts of a very remote and primitive stage is too veiled and highly figurative, and when all the figures are removed, they contain no more than what the people already knew by their own vernaculars. However, we expect that one great good will come out of them. The people now divided into so many different sects and con-

* By Prof. Rajarama Rama Krishna Bhagavata. Published by Tukarama Javaji, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1898. Price 8 As.

flicting creeds will in the light of their past history begin truly to throw off their idiosyncracies, and even if they cannot go back or coalesce, there will be greater good feeling between them. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the English translation and introduction and notes appended, and the get up of the book and its cheapness are all that can be desired. The Editor pays due homage to the greatness of Sri Sankaracharya, whom one of our Siddhanta Teachers, Saint Umapathi Sivacharya speaks of as '*Mahan Sri Sankaracharya*' but at the same time he is not oblivious to the great drawbacks in his expositions. And says he :—

"The mission of Sankaracharya was the diffusion of the doctrine of the identity of the individual with the universal soul. With this one great idea ever present before him, he is always anxious to establish the imaginary syntactical unity of the Vedanta texts. He had no occasion for a critial study of the various Upanishads' which as a matter of fact, represent the views of many independent and often conflicting schools. When there are differences even in regard to the daily rites to be performed by the members of the various Vedic schools, when schism has worked its way even among the followers of Yajur-Veda, the syntactical unity even among the Vedic texts is an impossibility. How much more impossible must the syntactical unity of the Vedantic texts be to a critical eye? Sankaracharya evidently possessed all the powers of a critic of a very high order, but as they conflicted with his great idea, and as the times also were ill suited, he had no occasions to use them or opportunities to develop them. *This fondness for syntactical unity is the great drawback*, which makes his otherwise very valuable commentary not quite always a safe guide in finding out and fixing the meaning of Vedantic texts in not a few places. *Another drawback* is that when the syntactical unity is not in peril Sankaracharya omits altogether to notice words and expressions which at times are found to be very material in determining the meaning of the texts. Barring these two drawbacks Sankaracharya is otherwise a safe and therefore a very valuable guide."

We commend most heartily the enterprise and the public spirit of the editor and publisher, and we have no doubt that the Marathi speaking people in our own Presidency will patronize the publication.

II. **The Psychology of Buddhism.*** By C. C. Bose. This is a reprint of the contribution to the *Mahobodhi Journal* and for any one who desires a succint and clear exposition of Buddhist Metaphysics and Ethics, we can commend this short treatise. The 2nd chapter treats of Skandas, and Mr. Bose is in perfect agreement with us in holding that Buddhism aknowledges no Ego which we call the *Atman* and the Christians, the Soul. We have elsewhere expressed our dissent from the attempt of Mr. Chatterj to identtify our *Atman* and Soul with the Vignana Skandha of Buddha, and Mr. Bose observes :—

"The Pitakas distinctly declare that none of these Skandas or divisions of the qualities of sentient beings is the Soul, when everything including man is subject to change, then every material part of him must change. The Bnddhist scriptures teach that there cannot be anything permanent, out of impermanent something." The other chapters deal with 'Karma and Rebirth,' 'Conduct,' 'Concentration;' The four paths, Contemplation,' 'Wisdom and Nirvana.'

"The culmination of Buddha's teachings is the realization of that state of blissful thought unconnected with sorrow; and the life of the student has to be so regulated as to make his progress sure. It is a life of self-conquest; a struggle for peace. The control of self is indeed a difficult achievement; but the struggling aspirant who fights on unceasingly against his lower, selfish sensual nature ultimately triumphs and realizes the fruits of his life in the enjoyment of the bliss of calm thought in solitude—Samadhi."

Whatever may be said as to the merit of Bhuddist metaphysics nothing can be grander than the Ethical Ideal of Buddha; and we heartily commend the book to our readers.

* Published by the Mahobodhi Society, Calcutta, 1898. Price 4 as.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

We are glad to acknowledge with thanks a new magazine entitled 'The *New Century*' under the able editorship of Mrs. Katherine Tingley devoted to the cause of Universal Brotherhood. It is an illustrated weekly and the get up is everything that is desirable and the contents are most interesting. We tender our thanks to our other exchanges both Indian and European.

***

We congratulate Mr. R. S. Vedachalam Pillay, Tamil Pundit of the Christian College, in having brought out in a collected form four very ancient and excellent works in Tamil, hitherto unpublished and which are ascribed to a Siddha called *Chittambala Nadigal.* The collection is called by the editor *Siddanta Gnanabotham*, and contains 10 forms, and it is cheap at the price offered namely 8 annas. We will notice the book at length in our next.

***

WHEN we visited *Kalugumalai* last, the scene of that grim tragedy some years back, we noted that whereas the Mahomedans and Lubbays were allowed to take the water from the temple tank and frequent also some parts of the temple, the Shanars were absolutely prohibited from touching the water and going into the outer courts. This only confirmed our belief that the reason for the ostracism of some of the Tamilian-sections were more political than religious. It is remarkable how freely and intimately the

Mahomedans in South India move with the Tamilians, and how strongly marked is the feeling between the Hindus and Mahomedans in North India. In the South, the last dominant power was that of the Mahomedans, whereas in the North, there was a terrible conflict for supremacy between the Hindu and Mahomedan powers, when fortunately, the English interfered and took the morsel for themselves. In South India, a stroke of the pen achieved what in North India, was accomplished at an enormous sacrifice in men and money. While touring in the Tinnevelley District, we freely spoke our mind about the Shanar question (we found even non-Shanar Christians taking sides against Shanars) to several friends and requested them in the name of our religion and our country to bring about an amicable understanding between our own people. But alas! The less we speak about our leaders, the better for them.

***

Punditha Manonmani Ammal requests us to bring to the notice of the Tamil public, the word ஒருவள், which she claims to have first brought into use. We see no objection ourselves to the use of the word; much less do we see any harm in continuing the old world. The உயர்வுப்பன்மை ஒருவர் and அவர் can be used in the Faminine gender as well.

***

For want of space, we have to postpone the Revd. Dr. Pope's article on the "Poets of the Tamil lands" to our next.

***

The April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* contains The Rev. Dr. Pope's further contribution on "the Poets of the Tamil lands"—and it is devoted to the truly Divine Tiruvallur, whom he regards as an ecletic in religion and philosophy and which religion and philosophy he says is based love and faith and he concludes:

"But the Tamil race preserves many of its old virtues, and has the promise of a noble future. Their English friends, in teaching them all that the West has to impart, will find little to unteach in the moral lesson of the Kurral rightly understood."

***

The same number contains another admirable paper contributed by Mr. J. Kennedy B. C. S. (Ret), "on the teaching of true Indian History". After observing that the chief end of education is not intellectual but moral and that the chief virtues which men acquire by education are reverence and self-respect, and that the ancient system of Hindu training put reverence above all things, whereas lay all its vitality and free so that self-respect is best learned by the history of one's own family and people, he points out how egregiously they have blundered in teaching the true Indian History and how the present educational policy has been the most signal of failures. We extract the following important paras, as they fully bear out sentiments we have already expressed in these pages. The editor in a short note also points out how the "Anglo-Oriental Punjab University" failed, from the 'secularizing' tendencies of the Educational Department. Mr. Kennedy says:

"We have not as yet europeanised Indian administration. In our educational policy, however, we adopted an entirely different course. Instead of a progressive conservatism founded upon native ideas, we made a brand-new departure: we forget that the first duty of a successful teacher must be to study his pupil. We introduced a new system of education entirely abentra, which was necessarily European but without the saving elements of European education. To make it fit for everyone we made it so purely intellectual that it is good for no one. The root being bad, the tree and fruit must be bad also.

"The Hindus are a sentimental and romantic race: the English practical and matter of fact. It ought to have been the aim of our educational policy to bridge over the gulf. It can be done.

"To preserve what was good' of the old, to graft on it what was adaptable and excellent in the new, to bring Englishmen and natives into friendly social relations, and to make the Professors line with and act upon the students, these are, for instance, the main elements of the system at the Anglo Mahomedan College at Aligarh. It was an Englishman who first obliged its students to attend the daily prayers of their respective communities. Englishmen live with its students, dine with them, play with them. I can vouch for the results so far as the upper classes of the Aligarh District are concerned. Aligarh was, to say the least, not noted for its loyalty in the mutiny; and now I do not know a more enlightened body of native gentlemen than the leading gentlemen of the Aligarh District."

"It is, indeed, for the leaders of native thought to show us what they need, rather than for us to thrust educational nostrums upon them. Our higher educational policy at present is a failure, whether judged by its effects on character, or by its political results; it bids fair to be the cancer of the British Empire: it requires to be reformed, and, above all, to be moralized. Indian History certainly, affords much material for moral training if it is taught scientifically and in a spirit of sympathy and generous appreciation for indigenous civilizations."